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#### Interpretation: “workers” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that a just government recognizes a specific group of workers unconditional right to strike

Nebel 19. [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution.” Vbriefly. August 12, 2019. <https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/?fbclid=IwAR0hUkKdDzHWrNeqEVI7m59pwsnmqLl490n4uRLQTe7bWmWDO_avWCNzi14> TG

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions.

Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window.

So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why.

“Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons.

First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural.

Second, “colleges and universities” fails the [upward-entailment test](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#IsolGeneInte) for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals.

Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universitiesz generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution.

#### It applies to “workers” – 1] upward entailment test – “a just government ought to recognize workers unconditional right to strike” doesn’t entail that a just government ought to recognize peoples unconditional right to strike because it doesn’t prove all people should strike, 2] adverb test – adding “always” doesn’t change its meaning because recognition is unconditional.

#### Violation: They spec teachers

#### Standards:

#### 1] Precision – the counter-interp justifies them doing away with random words in the rez which decks ground and prep because the aff is no longer bounded by the rez. Voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### 2] Limits and ground – their model allows affs to defend anything from teachers to doctors to the police— there's no universal DA since each has different functions and implications — that explodes prep and leads to random worker of the week affs which makes neg prep impossible.

#### 3] TVA solves – you could’ve read your plan as an advantage under a whole res advocacy.

#### Fairness – debate is an activity that requires fairness for evaluation.

#### Drop the debater to deter future abuse and set better norms for debate.

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention but we creates a race to the top where we create the best norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

#### Reject 1AR theory and independent voters – sandbagging o/w, irresolvable o/w, splitting o/w
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#### The Atlantic slave trade marked the birth of modern logistics and racial capitalism that was characterized by endless access and a drive for endless control. Even through this global regime of racialized violence, logistics is vulnerable to logisticality – a glitch amongst those in the grips of total access.

Harney et al. 18 Stefano Harney in conversation with Niccolò Cuppini and Mattia Frapporti, September 2018, “Logistics Genealogies: A Dialogue with Stefano Harney,” Social Text 136 • Vol. 36, No. 3, DOI 10.1215/01642472-6917802 Recut Justin

Modern logistics is a commercial logistics, with all the multiple sources that feed what Cedric Robinson calls racial capitalism. And it’s a capitalist science. Even today’s military logistics is most commonly outsourced to commercial rms, who make huge prfiots off the logistics of contempo- rary permanent war. As a commercial logistics, as a capitalist science, it can be traced directly and emphatically to the Atlantic slave trade. The Atlantic slave trade was the birth of modern logistics, as it was also the birth of a new kind of war on our species being, and the birth of racial cap- italism, which amounts to saying the same thing. This trade entailed the first global movement of mass commodities, voluminous and grotesque. Moreover, these humans were also perishable and volatile commodities that could “go missing” and were hard “to extract,” requiring complex, even diabolical, logistical technologies, supported by finance, insurance, law, and of course state and extrastate violence. Ian Baucom locates the origins of modern insurance in the Atlantic slave trade in his important work Spectres of the Altantic. We know from Sergio Bologna how much contemporary finance and logistics are entwined in today’s overleveraged global shipping industry, but this was true of the Atlantic slave trade too, where speculative finance was already at work. The story of the Zong slave ship is central to Baucom’s account and is also beautifully, unbearably rendered by M. NourbeSe Philip in her book-length poem Zong!, captur- ing what the birth of modern logistics did to any possible project of the human by bringing finance and logistics together in a devilish alliance over the commodity that really “could speak,” the “thing” that talks or is somehow in touch, neither subject nor proper object, a massive, subter- ranean, ethereal, undercommon threat to the individuation of modern “Man” emerging at the same time. But the Atlantic slave trade was also the birth of modern logistics because modern logistics is not just about how to transport large amounts of commodities or information or energy, or even how to move these ef- ficiently, but also about the sociopathic demand for access: topographical, jurisdictional, but as importantly bodily and social access. The nearly complete access that was imposed upon the African enslaved, upon the African continent, and upon the lands and indigenous peoples settled for plantations, this kind of access remains the ambition of logistics today, and it is for this reason that the slave trade remains so contemporary, that abolition as Jared Sexton rightly says is yet to come. And we might add that this abolition requires the abolishment of logistics which in its flows created a people without standing anywhere. We act in abolition not for a ground to stand on but for groundations beyond standing. Modern logistics, with its warehousing and its containers, is as much about controlling the flow as ensuring the flow, as much about the interface of movement of commodities and financialization of commodities as it is about just get- ting goods somewhere. That interface is an opportunity for speculation, and today the line itself, the supply line and the assembly line, their speed, efficiency, and metrics, are a source of massive financial speculation. This is also the horrific legacy of the Atlantic slave trade, the containerization of people, of the sociopathic access demanded to labor and sex, and the storage, in forts, in the hold. And even more murderously, the elimination of goods, of cargo, when the price falls, or considerations of finance as in the incident of the slave ship the Zong, in which 133 enslaved persons were thrown overboard for insurance purposes during a logistical operation. In short, this aggregated access allowed for the most evil calculations about the perishability of goods, the planned obsolescence of products, and the cost of replacement, in a word, financial speculation on the supply line that was in the case of the African enslaved in the Atlantic trade often indis- tinguishable from the assembly line. Marx said the rst thing the worker makes is himself. The slave was worker on the line and at the same time the supply coming off the line and into the line. The same concerns with speculation on the line, the line as a modulation of investment and exploi- tation of labor are still found today at Walmart or Starbucks, not so far from their origins, at least for the most part. As Susan Zieger reminds us in her study of “Box” Brown and logistics — he was the slave who mailed himself in a box to “freedom” from the slave-plantation South to the slave-dependent North in the United States — logistics incorporates loss in its logics. As Fred Moten and I say, logistics tracks us because it assumes fugitivity. Indeed, what is called surveillance might also be called preemptive logistics. It is possible that all we know of surveillance studies, including its most incisive work in black surveillance like Simone Browne’s, could also go under the name preemptive logistics, even predictive logistics, the anticipation not of resistance but of a kind of impenetrability even in the give. In other words, our entangled, indeterminate, undercommon rub- up of curvy lines, kinks, loops, and crooked lines summons logistics. It reacts to our sumptuous tangle. Our entanglement requires them to draw up contingency plans, which are plans to make our indeterminacy mere contingency, to account for what goes missing. Logistics is the science of loss, the science of their lost means, which is to say it will always be the white science and the science of being white. Logistics is the science of their loss, not ours, though we, and those closest to blackness in particu- lar, suffer horrific losses from their loss. However, it was not just modern logistics that was born in this hell-fire. It was also the birth of what Fred and I call logisticality, a social capacity found most intensely amongst those who found themselves, who found each other, under the duress of almost total access but in the grip of each other. As Frank Wilderson writes at the end of Incognegro, his brilliant more-than-memoir: “Something happened to us in the hold.” And not just in the hold. In her heart-breaking but unavoidable book Lose Your Mother, Saidiya Hartman speaks of the fugitivity that the ungoverned and the ungovernable of Africa were forced to invent because of the reach of the Atlantic slave trade. Those captured by the trade either were or became the people Cedric Robinson understands in Africa as living by a principle of “individual” incompleteness. Such peoples existed everywhere, as James Scott asserts in The Art of Not Being Governed. Scott details how highland peoples in Southeast Asia avoided the massive slave trade of the padi states, at trade that dominated precolonial Southeast Asia to the point that slaves became not only the biggest trade but currency itself. In many languages of the padi states these peoples were already known by the name slave before they were enslaved. These peoples refused to form political societies, have leaders, or see land as owned or even shared in ownership. They gathered, and they wandered. No written languages, they sought refuge with each other. But the hold, the middle passage, the ­fire that African peoples went through, those who were captured, and those who became fugitive, created something perhaps unprecedented in its total span across societies and histories. This is what Fred and I call logisticality, the ability to fi­nd each other, to move together, to break the rule of Newtonian time and space, disorder it, and legislate new time and space to disorder, to gather, stranded into refuge together. A people came into existence without origin — anoriginal, as Nahum Chandler would say — who were “in touch,” whose response to the sociopathic demand for access was paradoxically and necessarily a radical opening of being, a practice of touch without surface or border or edge, a practice of hapticality. Fred and I understand hapticality as a kind of touch without surface that undoes, that saps the fever of individuation, in a sometimes violent and profane exorcism. It is not a reassuring touch. It unensures precisely because it’s a loving touch. In a sense, African slaves who came through the ­re could be said to have reversed logistics and overturned it. Now the slaver sought this logisticality, sought but could not fully capture something that had been produced in capture but also preceded it as Robinson and Scott suggest, calling capture into being in all its murderous regulatory force. We can understand this logisticality in two registers, as I’ve suggested: First, in C. L. R. James’s famous contention that slaves ran the plantations in the Caribbean — that it was the slaves who had the capacity and know-how to work across half a dozen African and European languages in this early crucible of world capitalism — it was the slaves who worked the nascent capitalist machinery of the sugar mills and who handled the logistics of transport to the ships, and sometimes on the ships. It was the slaves who worked in exchanges of different currencies, commodities, and calculations of the future, with world prices. The slaves also ran the households, providing the care, nurturing, and attention. Now as James would be quick to point out, all this occurred despite the unbounded inhumanity and cruelty of the owners, as for instance he details in his chapter on owners and on the property in the Black Jacobins. All of this was also going on in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries at a time when, as James notes, most of our families in Italy and across Europe, as we might say, “still only knew the bell tower.” This logisticality — the quantum ­nding, this hapticality, this feel without surface that hurts and loves — could also be understood as a capacity to recreate Robinson’s principle of incompleteness and, indeed, to detect and translate such principles of incompleteness and ungovernability, of the unregulated, the disorderly and the unruled, to feel these things, and feel others feeling you being undone. This hapticality was never going to be fully enslaved, even when American slavery turned to its speci­c Taylorist brutality and slave breeding with the rise of the cotton trade and industrial capitalism at the end of the eighteenth century. But more importantly, it survives as the basis of the black radical tradition, in radical social poesis, as Laura Harris says. It survives in/as blackness. So the shipped, the containerized, the accessed of the Atlantic slave trade gave birth to modern logistics but also conjured something in the break of this massive enclosure of those who lived together by the principle of incompleteness. And despite this, it is fundamentally necessary to place that hapticality against what Christina Sharpe, writing recently about the slave ship and its wake, might call its “weather,” the pervasive antiblack racism that this founding of modern logistics also bequeathed the contemporary world and perpetuates today.

#### Endless access is inextricably tied to the logic of improvement and the Algorithm of work broadly – the demand for the right to strike is subsumed by logistical capitalism.

Moten and Harney 15 [Fred, Professor of Performance Studies for the Tisch School of the Arts at NYU, PhD in English from UC Berkeley, 2020 MacArthur Genius Fellow, Stefano, Professor of Strategic Management for the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Singapore Management University, PhD in Social and Political Sciences from the University of Cambridge, co-founder of Ground Provisions—a curatorial collective, founder of the School for Study—a nomadic study collective, 2015, “Mikey the Rebelator,” Performance Research, 20:4, 141-145, DOI: 10.1080/13528165.2015.1071057] Justin

Paolo Friere thought our incompleteness is what gave us hope.7 It is our incompleteness that inclines us toward one another. For Friere, the more we think of ourselves as complete, finished, whole, individual, the more we cannot love or be loved. Is it too much to put this the other way around? To say, by way of Friere, that love is the undercommon self-defence of being-incomplete? This seems important now when our incompleteness is something we are invited and then compelled to address and improve, when we are told to be impatient with it, and embarrassed by it. We need to be intact. We’re told to raise our buzz because we’re all fucked up. But in our defence we love that we are complete only in a plained incompletion, which they would have undone, finished, owned, and sent on down the line. We do mind working because we do mind dying. THE CONSU LTANT The consultant is not here to provide solutions, innovation or even advice. The consultant exists to demonstrate access in the era of logistical capitalism. The consultant is not an ideologue. Ideology operates here only for the consultant himself. He is demonstrably the only one who believes his bullshit, but fortunately for him this is not the point, not his point. The consultant literalizes access to workplaces, demonstrating their openness by showing up in their midst, like a drone. One day you come to work and there he is sitting next to the boss. Nothing she says or does is as important as this demonstration of access. What the consultant introduces into the imposed, exposed workers’ corp is the algorithm. The consultant bears the algorithm, which violates in the name of completion. When the consultant brings his algorithmic charge, the body of the workers, that undesired and constantly invaded enclosure, is finished. We are rendered complete, made free, by the work, in the work, of the algorithm. We are done, and done in by, the consultant’s forced, aggressive incorporation of an undoing that was of and for itself, of and for ourself, the undoing we keep on making in the face of every sovereign invasion, every violent ascription of words and worth and (the) work. The consultant completes, so that he can access the private loop of a thwarted desire to be intact. It is not the product or even the organization that interests the algorithm of work. It is the production line’s infinite curvature. The algorithm of work is a demonstration within a demonstration. With access comes (the necessity of) improvement, which always takes the form of a demand for more access. As the introduction of the consultant inside the organization demonstrates access, so the introduction of the algorithm demonstrates improvement. The algorithm is the machine of self-improvement; as such, it is the only machine that makes new machines. There is a mirror – marking and instantiating self-envisaging’s shared exclusivity, that scary, silly, Stuart Smalleyish binary solipsism – that stands between it and man, the other only machine that makes new machines and, in so doing, improves itself. The mirror between man, the mirror, and The Man, man’s mirror, is the algorithm. Meanwhile, the inhuman, which is our fleshly inherence and inhabitation in the general mechanics of a general disregard for self-reflection, makes machines because it does not want to improve. Before the algorithm, machines came from strikes, from resistance, from sabotage. Machines made from the algorithm do not wait for the class struggle. The algorithm of work subjects every labour process on the production line to undoing, disassembly and incompletion, in order to demand it be completed better, assembled better, done better. It leaves behind not an improved organization but a metric to ensure the organization will never be satisfied. The metric measures everything against its last instance, ensuring that the last instance never comes. The metric demands more access, more measurement of access, more movement, more assembly, more measure of the last instance, which is given in and as enclosure. The consultant is still talking but it does not matter now what he says. The algorithm of work has arrived, algorithmic surplus has gone viral. If the settler could not be heard over the screams of primitive accumulation, and the citizen could not be heard over the noise of the machines, the consultant cannot be heard over the click of the metrics. Mikey heard this noise and walked the other way, another way, so the algorithm could not pass through, so we could hold him up and pass him along. Nahum Chandler reminds us of a term W. E. B. DuBois invented and employed; ‘democratic despotism’8 . When the consultant cannot demonstrate access, and therefore the algorithm cannot demonstrate improvement, the consultant calls for policy as once (and still) the citizen calls for heteropatriachal nationalism or the settler for racist manifest destiny. Policy is past all that, even though all that’s not past. Policy comes in to diagnose what’s blocking access, and what’s blocking access are ‘those people’. What’s wrong with those people in Detroit who want water, in British Columbia who want land, in Manila who want some place to stay? Policy says there is something wrong with those people that makes it so that the consultant can’t get access. But it is the other way around. The consultant is denied access – those people deny him access – because they embrace the general access-in-antagonism that he denies. And so policy must be called. Selfdefence becomes the disease. Love becomes the problem because love is the problem, the self-defence of the accessible. But, hey, maybe governance can help, which is to say maybe those practising self-defence may be willing to self-diagnose, self-reflect, self-improve! One way or another policy will proscribe, or policy will get posed – as democracy, as democratic despotism, where everyone is given the chance to say there is something wrong with those people. Democratic despotism is the imposition of policy and its violent possibilities and impossibilities on the wrong(ed). Because the thing is, the consultant’s not wrong, the algorithm of work is not malfunctioning, the policy hustler is not misdiagnosing. We’re wrong, which is why we’re wronged. We are incomplete. Moreover, they got the very idea of incompleteness from us! Another word for incompleteness is study, or more precisely, revision. The consultant gets this revision from us, from study, from our sumptuous revisions of one another out of existence, as existence. Study happens and it don’t stop. In study, we are engaged consciously and unconsciously. We revise, and then again. This is not just about distinguishing improvement as capitalist efficiency. That is too easy to dismiss. It is about improvement itself, the time-concept, the moral imperative, the aesthetic judgement, which is to say capitalist improvement founded in and on black flesh, its female informality. Revision has no end and no connection to improvement, never mind efficiency. So the consultant does and undoes institutions but can’t access instituted life, can’t open black life, can’t uncover queer life, can’t expose feminist planning around the ‘kitchen table’ as Barbara and Beverly Smith called it and Tiziana Terranova calls to it again, all noting certain paradoxes of freedom and sequestration in little general intellects of surreal life.9 He can’t access open secrets, can’t incomplete what is already incomplete, can’t deform what is always informal already and yet; they can’t believe and this leads to the state emergency that goes under such names as resilience and preparedness. When democratic despotism fails, simple despotism in the name of democracy must be imposed. Resilience is the name for the violent destruction of things that won’t give, won’t return to form, won’t bend when access is demanded, won’t be flexible and (com)pliant. Stopping when you are told to stop and moving along when you are told to move along demonstrates resilience and composure; but broken, breaking, dissed assembly demonstrates itself openly, secretly, dissembling in captured but inaccessible glance, for us, to us, as incomplete and much more than complete. Its daimonic performance can’t be individuated and won’t be performed. HOL D SHE It’s not about who’s holding you down when you try to jay-walk; it’s about who’s holding you up. This is the question of hapticality. The police can’t hold what’s already held. At the same time, what’s already held is all that we can hold. That’s our haptic institution. Watching mama listen to a song, you’re instituted. Here go that Michael Jackson song she turned up to teach me how to dance. In the photograph, they containerize her but she is uncontained. They bend her because access and logistics strive to be one. The more she is captured by the police, the photographer, the viewer, the more she is shipped. But the more she is shipped, the more she is held, the more she is handed.

#### Statist affirmations allows for endless access by predetermining every interaction.

Bey 20 Marquis Bey, 2020, “Anarcho-Blackness: Notes Toward a Black Anarchism,” AK Press, SJBE

But, ahh, the classics... The anarchist canon, as it were, has had its central tenets—if such an anti-authoritarian, non-doctrinal intellectual praxis like anarchism can be said to have tenets—expressed by many of the aforementioned figures. To summarize, anarchism is the general critique of centralized, hierarchical, and thus oppressively coercive systems of power and authority. State power and capitalism are the culprits responsible for the horrors that surround us, being deemed by anarchists as monopolistic and coercive, and hence illegitimate. The State, for instance, is inextricable from domination, Bakunin arguing that, “If there is a State, there must be domination of one class by another.”1 In theory, anarchism is touted to oppose all kinds of oppression, be it racism, sexism, transanatagonism, classism, colonialism, ageism, etc. While there has been much less explicit meditation on the anarchist stance toward transanatagonism than, say, capitalism, the overarching claim of anarchist ideology is that any kind of coercive, dominative oppression is to be quashed. To be established instead is a society based on direct democratic collaboration, mutual aid, diversity, and equity. “From each according to his [sic] ability, to each according to his [sic] need.” Though there are those who are more strict about incorporating those who preceded the nineteenth-century heyday of people beginning to explicitly call themselves, and rally around a political movement called anarchism, I will not partake in such gatekeeping, for better (where a longer lineage of anarchist thought can be mobilized) or worse (where any form of dissent might be unjustifiably subsumed under anarchism, diluting its specificity and historical situatedness). Like Kropotkin, one might understand the Epicureans and Cynics as anarchists, since they avoided participation in the political sphere, retreated from governmental life, and advocated allegiance to no state or party. They lacked the “desire to belong either to the governing or the governed class.” Kropotkin understands this as a proto-anarchic anti-State and anti- authoritarian disposition. Far from meaning that everyone is left alone and unorganized, anarchism in the classical sense privileges democratic and communal relationality, obviating external rule and control. This is a positive conception of anarchism as voluntary participation predicated on each individual’s autonomy and agreement with communal values. It bears noting, though, that an anarchist society may take different forms: socialist anarchism, which emphasizes developing communal groups that are intended to thrive in the absence of hierarchies and a centralized governmental structure; or individualist anarchism, some of which reject any and all group identities, communal mores of the good, and venerate individual autonomy. Max Stirner represented perhaps the furthest pole of this tendency, with his refusal to obey any law or any state, even if it was collectively arrived at. The self is the only arbiter of one’s life. As well, there is anarcho-syndicalism, which supports workers in a capitalist society gaining control over parts of the economy, and emphasizes solidarity, direct participation, and the self- management of workers. Additionally, anarcho-syndicalism has the aim of abolishing the wage system, seeing it as inextricable from wage slavery. Life under non-anarchist rule conceives of the political arena as a good that exists to protect and serve the people; or better, a system chosen by the people. So much of ancient Greek philosophies, modern liberal philosophies, and political philosophies assert, in various ways, that obedience to the law is a prima facie duty and inarguable good. Anarchism has called this very foundation into question. What arises in the hopeful disintegration of rule by an authoritarian nation-state is a society that cares for one another communally and democratically without the need for a tyrannical force of coercion and sovereignty. Anarchists like Godwin and Proudhon and Bakunin based this anarchist society on beliefs in reason, universal moral law, education, and conscience. With this very brief overview, the task set forth here is slightly different. It parallels yet departs from, as well as stands in contrast to, this anarchist history—an anarchic “shadow history,” if you will, a para-anarchism that anarchizes anarchism. What is not being done here is an attempt to find heads or figures of Black anarchism to give clout to it as a wing of anarchism as a whole. While I will surely cite throughout this chapter, as well as subsequent chapters, the thought of people like Lucy Parsons, the Black Rose Anarchist Federation, Lorenzo Kom’boa Ervin, and Zoé Samudzi, this project is in fact not concerned with simply trotting out a list of anarchist Black people as the meaning of Black anarchism. I am articulating an anarcho- Blackness, first and foremost, as an inhabitable modality of anarchic subjectivity and engagement. This may lead to a discernible Black anarchism. Fine. But the aim is not to arrive at Black anarchism; it is, rather, to engage an anarcho-Blackness that moves toward what might be called a Black anarchism. There are a number of racialized, gendered, and racialized gendered elisions present in classical anarchist theorizations that demand being pointed out. Bakunin: “If there is a State, there must be domination of one class by another and, as a result, slavery; the State without slavery is unthinkable—and this is why we are the enemies of the State.”2 Overlooked here is how the history of the enslavement of peoples of Color, specifically Black people in the Western world, is the haunting specter of his claim. The condition of the slave, which is on one plane the condition of Blackness, is the relationship between a people to the State. Thus, anarchism, in its anti-Statism, must reckon full force with Blackness as Blackness serves as the distinct angle of vision for encountering the effects of State-sanctioned enslavement and oppression. To abolish slavery necessitates the liberation of Blackness, making anarchism an emancipatory project, a project that has as its foundation a grappling with Blackness. On the topic of the State, there has also been the tendency to collapse the relative effects of violence. That is, if it is indeed true that the State bears a hostile relationship to those it controls, there are some who are controlled in different ways and who feel the force of the State in more acute ways. To rest at the nexus of Black and trans, for example, is to feel the brunt of the State in scrutinizing, gender binaristic, and racializing ways, which give one over to the likelihood of poor housing conditions, lack of job access, increased rates of incarceration (which then subjects one to the gendered carcerality of prisons and its pervasive mis-gendering violence), and the like. Examine the lives of Miss Major, Marsha P. Johnson, CeCe McDonald. Anarchic meditation on the terrors of the State begin in the right direction, but they fall short of taking the critique as deeply as it demands. A critique of the State is in order too, though. A traditional focus on the State as the end-all be-all of oppression must be thought of as more than simply a governmental agency or bastion up on high doling out sentences and decrees. The State is, too, a relation, a way of dictating how people are to be interacted with. We encounter one another on the logics of intelligibility that the State demands, and that structures how one can appear to others, circumscribing subjective parts and desires that fall outside of this framework. And this is a violence. We must also note how this relation is not only in the public sphere but characterizes any sphere in which interaction is had. And furthermore, these relations are textured by racial and gender hierarchies. One relates to others on their presumed gender, their presumed race, and disallows them to be otherwise than this fundamentally externally imposed subjectivity. The other has had no opportunity to announce themselves to us on non-State grounds. Any anarchism, then, must recognize this and commit to dismantling their

#### Specifically, regulating the strike into the right to strike allows the state to dictate revolution – that diffuses planning into policy and subverts radicality.

Crépon 19 Mark Crépon (French philosopher), translated by Micol Bez “The Right to Strike and Legal War in Walter Benjamin’s ‘Toward the Critique of Violence,’” Critical Times, 2:2, August 2019, DOI 10.1215/26410478-7708331 Recut Justin

If we wish to understand how the question of the right to strike arises for Walter Benjamin in the seventh paragraph of his essay “Zur Kritik der Gewalt,” it is impor­ tant to first analyze the previous paragraph, which concerns the state’s monopoly on violence. It is here that Benjamin questions the argument that such a monopoly derives from the impossibility of a system of legal ends to preserve itself as long as the pursuit of natural ends through violent means remains. Benjamin responds to this dogmatic thesis with the following hypothesis, arguably one of his most impor­ tant reflections: “To counter it, one would perhaps have to consider the surprising possibility that law’s interest in monopolizing violence vis­à­vis the individual is explained by the intention not of preserving legal ends, but rather of preserving law itself. [This is the possibility] that violence, when it does not lie in the hands of law, poses a danger to law, not by virtue of the ends that it may pursue but by virtue of its mere existence outside of law.”1 In other words, nothing would endanger the law more than the possibility of its authority being contested by a violence over which it has no control. The function of the law would therefore be, first and foremost, to contain violence within its own boundaries. It is in this context that, to demonstrate this surprising hypothesis, Benjamin invokes two examples: the right to strike guaranteed by the state and the law of war. Let us return to the place that the right to strike occupies within class struggle. To begin with, the very idea of such a struggle implies certain forms of violence. The strike could then be understood as one of the recognizable forms that this violence can take. However, this analytical framework is undermined as soon as this form of violence becomes regulated by a “right to strike,” such as the one recognized by law in France in 1864. What this recognition engages is, in fact, the will of the state to control the possible “violence” of the strike. Thus, the “right” of the right to strike appears as the best, if not the only, way for the state to circumscribe within (and via) the law the relative violence of class struggles. We might consider this to be the per­ fect illustration of the aforementioned hypothesis. Yet, there are two lines of ques­ tioning that destabilize this hypothesis that we would do well to consider. First, is it legitimate to present the strike as a form of violence? Who has a vested interest in such a representation? In other words, how can we trace a clear and unequivocal demarcation between violence and nonviolence? Are we not always bound to find residues of violence, even in those actions that we would be tempted to consider nonviolent? The second line of questioning is just as important and is rooted in the distinction established by Georges Sorel, in his Reflections on Violence, between the “political strike” and the “proletarian general strike,” to which Benja­ min dedicates a set of complementary analyses in §13 of his essay. Here, again, we are faced with a question of limits. What is at stake is the possibility for a certain type of strike (the proletarian general strike) to exceed the limits of the right to strike— turning, in other words, the right to strike against the law itself. The phenomenon is that of an autoimmune process, in which the right to strike that is meant to protect the law against the possible violence of class strugles is transformed into a means for the destruction of the law. The diference between the two types of strikes is nevertheless introduced with a condition: “The validity of this statement, however, is not unrestricted because it is not unconditional,” notes Benjamin in §7. We would be mistaken in believing that the right to strike is granted and guaranteed uncondi­ tionally. Rather, it is structurally subjected to a conflict of interpretations, those of the workers, on the one hand, and of the state on the other. From the point of view of the state, the partial strike cannot under any circumstance be understood as a right to exercise violence, but rather as the right to extract oneself from a preexisting (and verifiable) violence: that of the employer. In this sense, the partial strike should be considered a nonviolent action, what Benjamin named a “pure means.” The interpretations diverge on two main points. The first clearly depends on the alleged “violence of the employer,” a predicate that begs the question: Who might have the authority to recognize such violence? Evidently it is not the employer. The danger is that the state would similarly lack the incentive to make such a judgment call. It is nearly impossible, in fact, to find a single instance of a strike in which this recognition of violence was not subject to considerable controversy. The political game is thus the following: the state legislated the right to strike in order to con­ tain class strugles, with the condition that workers must have “good reason” to strike. However, it is unlikely that a state systematically allied with (and accomplice to) employers will ever recognize reasons as good, and, as a consequence, it will deem any invocation of the right to strike as illegitimate. Workers will therefore be seen as abusing a right granted by the state, and in so doing transforming it into a violent means. On this point, Benjamin’s analyses remain extremely pertinent and profoundly contemporary. They unveil the enduring strategy of governments confronted with a strike (in education, transportation, or healthcare, for example) who, afer claiming to understand the reasons for the protest and the grievances of the workers, deny that the arguments constitute sufcient reason for a strike that will likely paralyze this or that sector of the economy. They deny, in other words, that the conditions denounced by the workers display an intrinsic violence that jus­ tifies the strike. Let us note here a point that Benjamin does not mention, but that is part of Sorel’s reflections: this denial inevitably contaminates the (socialist) lef once it gains power. What might previously have seemed a good reason to strike when it was the opposition is deemed an insufcient one once it is the ruling party. In the face of popular protest, it always invokes a lack of sufcient rationale, allow­ ing it to avoid recognizing the intrinsic violence of a given social or economic situ­ ation, or of a new policy. And it is because it refuses to see this violence and to take responsibility for it that the left regularly loses workers’ support.

#### That continuous improvement paradoxically necessitates racialized genocide and ecological destruction.

**Moten and Harney 21** [Fred Moten, Professor of Performance Studies for the Tisch School of the Arts at NYU, PhD in English from UC Berkeley, 2020 MacArthur Genius Fellow, Stefano Harney, Professor of Strategic Management for the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Singapore Management University, PhD in Social and Political Sciences from the University of Cambridge, co-founder of Ground Provisions—a curatorial collective, founder of the School for Study—a nomadic study collective, 2021, *All Incomplete*, pp 13-18] GZ Recut Justin

What does it mean to stand for improvement? Or worse, to stand for what business calls **a ‘commitment to continuous improvement‘?** It **means** to stand for **the brutal speciation of all**. To take a stand for speciation is the beginning of a **diabolical usufruct**. **Improvement comes to us by way of an innovation in land tenure**, where **individuated ownership, derived from increasing the land’s productivity, is given in the perpetual**, and thus arrested, becoming of exception’s miniature. This is to say that from the outset, **the ability to own** – and that ability’s first derivative, **self-possession** – **is entwined with the ability to make more productive**. In order to be improved, to be rendered more productive, **land must be violently reduced to its productivity**, which is the **regulatory diminishment and management of earthly generativity**. Speciation is this general **reduction of the earth to productivity** and **submission of the earth to techniques of domination** that isolate and enforce particular increases in and accelerations of **productivity**. In this regard, (necessarily European) man, in and as the exception, imposes speciation upon himself, in an operation that **extracts and excepts himself from the earth** in order to confirm his supposed **dominion over it**. And just as **the earth must be forcefully speciated to be possessed**, man must **forcefully speciate himself** in order to enact this kind of possession. This is to say that **racialization is present in the very idea of dominion over the earth**; in the very idea and enactment of the exception; **in the very nuts and bolts of possession-by-improvement**. Forms of racialization that both Michel Foucault and, especially and most vividly, Robinson identify in medieval Europe become *usufructed* with modern possession through improvement. Speciated humans are **endlessly improved** through the **endless work** they do on their **endless way to becoming Man**. This is the usufruct of man. In early modern England, establishing title to land by making it more productive meant **eliminating biodiversity** and isolating and breeding a species – barley or rye or pigs. Localized ecosystems were aggressively transformed so that **monocultural productivity smothers anacultural generativity**. **The emergent relation between speciation and racialization is the very conception and conceptualization of the settler**. Maintenance of that relation is his vigil and his eve. For the encloser, possession is established through improvement – this is true for the possession of land and for the possession of self. **The Enlightenment is the universalization/ globalization of the imperative to possess and its corollary, the imperative to improve**. However, this productivity must always confront its contradictory impoverishment: the **destruction of its biosphere** and its **estrangement in, if not from, entanglement**, both of which combine to ensure **the liquidation of the human differential that is already present in the very idea of man, the exception**. To stand for such improvement is to **invoke policy**, which attributes depletion to the difference, which is to say the wealth, **whose simultaneous destruction and accumulation policy is meant to operationalize**. **This attribution of a supposedly essential lack**, an inevitable and supposedly natural diminution, is achieved alongside **the imposition of possession-by-improvement**. **To make policy is to impose speciation upon everybody and everything, to inflict impoverishment in the name of improvement, to invoke the universal law of the usufruct of man**. In this context, continuous improvement, as it emerged with decolonization and particularly with the defeat of national capitalism in the 1970s, is the continuous crisis of speciation in the surround of the general antagonism. This is the contradiction Robinson constantly invoked and analyzed with the kind of profound and solemn optimism that comes from being with, and being of service to, your friends.

#### We affirm Anarcho-Blackness as an undercommon insurgency.

Bey 20 Marquis Bey, 2020, “Anarcho-Blackness: Notes Toward a Black Anarchism,” AK Press, SJBE

IT IS MISGUIDED TO PRESUME THAT AN ANARCHIC WORLD, A WORLD IN which, for classical anarchists, the State is eliminated—or a world in which, for Black queer feminist anarchists, racial capitalism and cisheteronormative patriarchy is overturned —is the “end” of anarchist pursuits. Anarcho-Blackness, with its disruptive disorderly conduct—its mode of conducting itself as, in other words, disorderly—advances a critical praxis that answers the fundamental political question, “What is to be done?” Kind of. The question “What is to be done?” demands an answer, not that the texture, tenor, or terms of that answer can be readily discerned. Nor does admitting this exculpate us from needing to, nevertheless, provide an answer. So again: what is to be done? Indeed, accosted by right-wing populism, virulent white supremacy, transantagonism, heteronormative patriarchy, and the litany of other violent regimes in our midst, we so earnestly want them to cease. We demand that it all end, now, and for justifiable reasons. I, though, animated by anarchism’s critical praxis—its practice of a criticality—do not place my crosshairs on a moment beyond now, when things might come to a close. This is not motivated by a nihilistic pessimism about the fate of the current political moment, where I cannot fathom cessation or even mitigation of various violences; this is not motivated by a perverse infatuation with the bounding persistence of hegemonic terrors. It is motivated by a kind of zeal, in fact, one where refusing an end allows for a perpetual openness that enables, always, the possibility of another beginning. Black anarchism’s emphasis on the constitutivity of the concepts of critical and praxis is fundamental here, as it itself is constituted through an indebtedness to Black queer and trans feminisms. This project is deeply theoretical, but also practical and material, because there is nothing more theoretically practical than trying to figure out how to fundamentally change the very system by which we live; indeed, to quote Zoé Samudzi, “What does it mean to create community that is safe for Black women, for Black trans women? That’s an incredibly theoretical exercise because that requires that we have all of these conversations and start to create material politics around misogynoir and trans misogynoir.”1 So the critical praxis and its theoretical heft is a ruthless interrogation of the established and institutionalized—in the vein of Marx’s 1843 call for die rücksichtlose Kritik alles Bestehenden (the ruthless criticism of all that exists); and if praxis is a doing, an agential enactment that bears on sociality, then a critical praxis marks an interrogative social enactment. What kind of politics might this lead to? What kind of world might this engender, and who might show up to this promiscuous gathering? The space cultivated by this critical praxis is where a Black anarchic politics and those subjectivated by an anarcho-Blackness, its attendant Black queer feminist electrical circuitry, show up. Those maroons, subversive intellectuals, fugitives, queers, feminists, anarchists, and rebellious workers meet to conspire together in the undercommons: a non-place where everyone is Black, queer, anarchic, because they are changed by the undercommons, which is not a place you enter but a groove that enters you. Critical praxis becomes a radical invitation to not only do but to be done by the undercommon insurgency that makes its own demands. And such an interrogation must suspend the presumption of an end goal. We know from Moten and Harney, and Jack Halberstam, that what we think we want before the crisis that precipitates our insurgency will necessarily shift after we’ve attained the limits of what our coalitional knowledge could compile. It is not because we are insufficient, as if insufficiency is a deficiency rather than a willingness to risk getting at the outer limits of what we dared to think; it is because we cannot, and must not, assume that the logics and rubrics we have when moving within the maelstrom of the hegemonic—radically altered as they may be—can operate to our benefit when we’ve unseated the hegemon. We will need new rubrics and metrics, unrubrics and unmetrics, because a radically other-world requires radically other means to love it, to caress it, to be all the way in it. So why is there no “end”? To assert this might seem to sidestep what Foucault claims in the Preface of Anti- Oedipus: to be “less concerned with why this or that than with how to proceed.” Refusing to bank on the “end” is, at least in part, how to proceed. “An abdication of political responsibility?” Moten and Harney write, anticipating the accusation. “OK. Whatever. We’re just anti-politically romantic about actually existing social life.”2 I submit that one’s concern must be an ethical one that—to supplement an oversight in Moten and Harney—not only sets its sights on social life that “actually” (I shiver at the hubris of this word) exists but, more substantively, fertilizes the conditions of possibility for otherwise and unsung and unknown emergence. There is no “end” because to know the end is to think one knows the totality of the landscape, a line of thinking that cannot account for that which falls outside the dictates of legibility. There might always be something else just outside, and we cannot close the discussion when we think it is over. Fugitive planning plans for what it cannot plan for by refusing to plan for it. So there is no end in sight because sight is not the only sense available to us. (But there is also no end in touch, smell, feel, or taste—or any other “sense.”) There is no end in sight because our end may only be someone else’s beginning or middle. Thus, our critical praxis, our interrogative social enactment, does something precisely when it commits to a political endeavor proliferating life where no life is said to be found. And the “where” of “life where no life is said to be found” is the place brought about by abolition. Abolition is fundamentally anarchic, as will be discussed at greater length in the final chapter. It is the eradication “of a society that could have prisons, that could have slavery, that could have the wage, and therefore not abolition as the elimination of anything but abolition as the founding of a new society.”3 This entails, to put it simply, the eradication of society inasmuch as “Society” is predicated on, constituted by, the existence of these things. Anarchism is the ground on which we assert the destitution of the terrain, a destitution that marks, according to the Invisible Committee, “a rupture in the fatality that condemns revolutions to reproduce what they have driven out, shattering the iron cage of counter-revolution.”4 Following this line of thinking, we might also say that destitution is another name for the position of Blackness, that “irreparable disturbance.”5 Destituting the world-as-is, the Blackening of the world, shifts what counts as the “real” terrain of politics. To be ungoverned is a quotidian practice (a way of life), and the space in which that practice is lived is a space of anarchy—not nihilism or chaos but life by other means. Anarcho-life. What Black anarchists seek to do is to found a new society, not necessarily by bringing about the destruction of myriad edifices of terror, violence, circumscription, and normativity but by cultivating the spaces and places that, by dint of their existence, instantiate the impossibility of the normative bastions that now surround us. We might call this justice, might call this a non-utopic utopia, a sanctuary. We might call it the undercommons. How, then, to do this? Upon a re-reading of The Undercommons, I was drawn, obsessively, to one phrase, one that struck me at first as dangerously wrongheaded. But, then, the revolutionary will always be dangerous. The revolutionary call that Moten and Harney require and that I’ve been obsessed with is this: they insist that our radical politics, our anarchic world-building must be “unconditional—the door swings open for refuge even though it may let in police agents and destruction.”6 As my grandmother might quip, what kind of foolishness is this? But it is not foolishness precisely because the only ethical call that could bring about the radical revolutionary overturning we seek is one that does not discriminate or develop criteria for inclusion and, consequently, exclusion. If the door swings open without a bouncer checking names, it means that whoever shows up will be let in, unconditionally, without conditions. The ethical demand here is to be monstrously inclusive, a lesson learned in the Black Radical Tradition, Black feminisms, and trans activism. Yes, the Law might send agents to infiltrate our conspiratorial sessions. Or, even worse, as has happened, our enemy might show up and sit with us in prayer before gunning us down. But, at the same time, a salvational figure might show up or, better yet, a fugitive might show up, asking us to provide her refuge and a safe harbor. And we must let her in—this is what is to be done—we must feed and shelter her, because this fugitive, any fugitive, might be the one we didn’t know we were doing all this insurgent conspiratorial work for. Answering “What is to be done?” carries a deeply ethical valence. The manner by which things get done and the result of the doing inflects to whom we owe allegiances, who is or is not on our minds, and most fundamentally for whom we wish to see the world changed. The doing we seek is committed to making a world for people we don’t yet know, people who might need a drastically different world, while understanding that even our idea of “worldness” might be predicated on the logics of normative regimes that limit our horizons. It is imperative, then, to commit to the work without presuming to know who the work is for, only committing to the work because it might allow for those we did not know existed to finally live. When we volunteer at the soup kitchen we must turn no one away, even and especially when they look like they just ate a hearty bowl of soup; when we are faced with imminent violence we must refuse to proliferate violence, because we’ve come into being via a violation and this bestows upon us the ethical commitment to mitigate that violence; when we hear a knock at the door and someone asking for help because they are being chased we must let them in. Again, “the door swings open...” Each entity that crosses the threshold is another possible signatory on our missives for “the antipolitics of dissent.”7 To take praxis seriously, a praxis that has as its never-‐ ending end the proliferation of nonnormative life and the livelihood of the unemerged, is to risk what we ultimately come to. We cannot be afraid of what we find in our critical praxis precisely because, if it commits to the aforementioned, it will indeed be scary and impossible to prepare for. That is the work of the monstrous—a liberatory, unanticipated salvation, that troubling interrogation of gender Susan Stryker finds in the trans; that divine portent that Derrida would argue is unannounceable, which is to say untamable, unable to be absorbed into existing logics; that claimable thingliness that Hortense Spillers says might “rewrite after all a radically different text.”8 Critical praxis in the undercommons—insurgent work being done by folks who were let in without paperwork and without vouchers because they, despite where they came from, got down to work for the revolution—is work for monsters, monstrous work. In the end, what I am asking for is assemblic work for those who are impoverished in spirit, who come together, an intimate proximity reached because we are doing the work not because of an ontologized accident. What I am asking for is a willingness to move toward becoming subjectivated by an analytical queerness, a radical transitivity, an anoriginal Blackness, where Blackness names a sociopoetic force of subversive irregularity and, as Moten expressed to me in an email exchange, “must be claimed by any and every body” who seeks to do anarchic work. What is being asked for, what is to be done, is a Blackening that inducts all those who live and be in the undercommons, stealing life so it can steal more life, pilfering resources and asking no permission, taking no responsibility, because the ones who need this stuff might not know they need it, and neither do we. But if we must hack into government security systems and disseminate the firewalled information, that is what is to be done; if we must lie about the destination of funding we are given, allocating it to unauthorized and unadvised and undisclosed locations, that is what is to be done; if we must sully ourselves by hanging around a bad crowd that is bad only because the good’s violent optics and ethics deem it so, then that is what is to be done.

#### The Role of the Ballot is to affirm planning as opposed to policy.

Greer 18 [GH; 2018; Concordia University, Art Education Department, Graduate Student; "Who Needs the Undercommons? Refuge and Resistance in Public High Schools," Brock Education: A Journal of Educational Research and Practice 28.1: 5-18.] Recut Justin

Planning While study in the undercommons is a sociality that provides refuge, joy, and resilience, planning is the ongoing process of resistance which protects study. In the terms of complexity theory, planning creates the conditions for study to emerge. Planning defends study, for example, by attending to methods, when economic forces are oriented toward outcomes. In such a case, study thrives in the fascination required to build a car from scratch but is extinguished by a production line. Planning may then take the form of activism against the process of de-skilling workers. Generally, study is in trouble where labour is detached from purpose, discovery, and agency; and planning poses resistance to such divisions. Resistance may take a passive form like absenteeism or an active form like student strikes; it is an ongoing social experiment. The subjects of difference who inhabit the undercommons initiate planning in support of further difference: “planning in the undercommons is not an activity, not fishing or dancing or teaching or loving, but the ceaseless experiment with the future presence of the forms of life that make such activities possible” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 74). Importantly, “[p]lanning is self-sufficiency at the social level, and it reproduces in its experiment not just what it needs, life, but what it wants, life in difference…” (p. 76). Planning resists the austerity of conformity. Difference may bring the concept of diversity to mind for social justice educators. There are a number of distinctions between the difference that propels planning in the undercommons and diversity as it is understood in the field of education. Social justice education organized around diversity involves “eliminating the injustice created when differences are sorted and ranked in a hierarchy that unequally confers power…” (Adams, Bell, Goodman, & Joshi, 2016, p. 3, emphasis in original). In this sense, equitable diversity is an end goal that is, significantly, often supported by the implementation of policy. Planning, on the other hand, is a process, rather than an outcome, that resists policy, as explained below. Planning appears distorted, if at all, from the commons where the rules are made: “Because from the perspective of policy it is too dark in there, in the black heart of the undercommons, to see” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 79). Planning may become invisible or appear criminal in the light. Historical examples of such distortions are plentiful. The Freedom Riders were planning in 1961, boarding buses into their own brutalization to desegregate the southern United States; in the light of curricular history, Freedom Riders disappear and are replaced by parliamentary motions. There was planning at the Stonewall Riots in June of 1969 when homeless queer kids led by trans women of colour revolted against police brutality; the political necessity of Stonewall disappears in the parade lights of Pride every year on its own anniversary. Planning made visible but distorted is apparent in current events in the criminalization of self-preservation: from immigration (Ackerman & Furman, 2013), to activism (Matthews & Cyril, 2017; Alonso, Barcena, & Gorostidi, 2013), to panhandling (Chesnay, 2013). Educators who wish to see the planning of the undercommons, or to make it visible to students, must research to discover the exclusions of curriculum. When we include stories like the Stonewall Riots or the Freedom Riders in our teaching, we offer a connection to students who see their lives reflected therein. Stories of resistance to injustice, particular to local contexts, are important educational resources. In addition to these, pedagogical models which support the development and scholastic direction, of planning skills among students include: problem-based learning (Walker, Leary, Hmelo-Silver, & Ertmer, 2015), choice-based art education (Douglas, & Jaquith, 2009), critical media literacy (Funk, Kellner, & Share, 2016), and anti-oppressive education (Kumashiro, 2000). Policy From the perspective of the undercommons, policy inevitably conflicts with the forms of study and planning described above. Policy is the instrument of efficiency; it seeks measurable, predictable outcomes. The immeasurable social experiments and emerging differences of planning and study cannot be reconciled with administrative control as exercised through policy. Policy from the perspective of the undercommons operates under three rules. First, it diagnoses planners as problematic and prescribes itself as the solution; “This is the first rule of policy. It fixes others” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 78). Second, policy requires the participation of planners in the fixing of themselves; “Participating in change is the second rule of policy.” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 80). In this way, participants implicate themselves in order to fulfill the third rule of policy: that “wrong participation” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 81) provokes all manner of crises. If there is no crisis then the participant is fixed and may be deputised in order to fix others. More commonly, any crisis at all proves that policy was right about the planners all along; and of course, they were bound to fail. The circular logic of policy as viewed from the undercommons reflects what Spade (2015) calls administrative violence. Spade (2015) details a story which I relate here to clarify the operations of policy. Bianca, a trans girl, was sent home from her high school in 1999 for wearing clothing that affirmed her gender. She was not allowed to return to her classes. Bianca’s parents called the school and received no response. Spade met Bianca in 2002 when she was homeless, unemployed, and attempting to leave an abusive relationship. Bianca had enrolled in a welfare work program but was outed as a trans woman by her male identification (ID). She was subsequently harassed and forced to quit, losing her income and making her ineligible for Medicaid. She became homeless, and because of her male ID she was barred from women’s shelters and fearful of further abuse at shelters for men. Without an address, medical benefits, or an income Bianca was unable to complete the process to correct her ID and could not afford the hormone treatments that allowed her to maintain a feminine appearance. Bianca’s ability to pass as a cisgender woman protected her on the street from further harassment by both the public and the police. In order to afford hormone injections, Bianca engaged in sex work. The injections were not regulated because they had to be obtained illegally which placed Bianca at increased risk of infection by HIV, hepatitis, and other diseases. Although Bianca’s story is not recent, the factors that contributed to her difficulties are relevant: transgender youth are still significantly over-represented in groups of early school leavers, homeless youth, and survivors of violence (Morton et al., 2018; Keuroghlian, Shtasel, & Bassuk, 2014). In the language of the undercommons Bianca planned to survive by expressing her gender, but this plan was subverted by school policy, causing her not to graduate and significantly reducing her prospects for employment. Following the first rule of policy according to the undercommons, Bianca’s school would not accept her attendance until she fixed her gender. Bianca then followed the second rule of policy and made attempts to become a participant. She tried to stay at shelters and enrolled in a social welfare work program. In each of these cases, she experienced the crisis of harassment. Following the third rule of policy, these crises were framed as the result of Bianca’s wrong participation: she did not have the right identification. For survival, Bianca must then become a fugitive by engaging in criminalized activity: sex work and the illegal procurement of hormones. In an educational context, considering policy, according to The Undercommons, pushes educators to ask how the rules in our schools create, rather than respond to, fugitivity among students. Fugitivity Being a fugitive according to The Undercommons means being marked as an outsider. Fugitivity happens to people when: first they act, and second policy outlaws those actions. But fugitivity must also be embraced. Those who refuse the rules of policy, as outlined above, become fugitive. Fugitives will not be fixed, refuse to participate, and deny responsibility for the crises that befall them. Fugitivity recognises systemic racism, classism, ableism, and cis/heteronormativity in the disallowance of demographic-specific behaviour. It is fugitive sociality that composes the undercommons in order to provide refuge and resistance. In high schools, the undercommons provides social refuge in the form of patient listening and covert smiles to: hat wearing, cell phone texting, hall running, affection displaying, fugitive students; and granola bar giving, grade fudging, student failing, smiling before Christmas, fugitive teachers. These now-fugitive activities are planning behaviours, they sustain study for those that commit them. These things have been happening since before policy determined that education is a predictable and measurable thing. Fugitive planners generate study with unforeseeable ends and immeasurable learning. Turning planners into fugitives has some effects: ease of administration and evaluation is one; the reinforcement of unjust hierarchies is another.

# Case

## Framework

### 1NC – AT: Extinction First

#### Algorithmic expansion targets discounted bodies first – computational analysis of value fails and leads to extinction and genocidal cleansing.

Mbembe 19 [Achille; Philosopher, postcolonial critical theorist, political scientist, and public intellectual from Cameroon. Member of the Wits Institute for Social and Economic Research at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa; “Bodies as borders,” 2019; From the European South; http://europeansouth.postcolonialitalia.it/journal/2019-4/2.Mbembe.pdf] Recut Justin

Part of what we are witnessing as a result is a novel imbrication, a symbiotic merging of life and mobility. To be alive, or to survive, is more and more co-terminus with the capacity to move. Just as living, movement, in turn, involves continual doublings, the incessant crossing of multiple lines and thresholds, multiple transitions across layers. Life itself is more and more taken as something that can be calculated and recombined rather than merely represented. Furthermore, we are witnessing a bifurcation between life on the one hand and bodies on the other hand. Nowadays, not every body is thought of as containing life. Discounted bodies are believed to contain no life as such. They are, strictly speaking, bodies at the limits of life, trapped in uninhabitable worlds and inhospitable places. The kind of life they bear or contain is not insured or is uninsurable, folded as it is in extreme and thin envelopes. Such bodies on the precipice are the most exposed to droughts**,** storms and famines**,** toxic waste and various experiences of effacement. Their livelihoods made impossible, they are the most likely to sustain the most ~~crippling~~ [harmful] wounds and injuries. Trapped human subjects often without escape, they bear the brunt of terrestrial life on a damaged planet (Tsing et al. 2017). At the same time, they exceed all attempts to contain them. These bodies are not simply in motion. Interactive and generative, they are movements and events. The inside of such bodies is not separated from their outward environments. From the perspective of discounted bodies, to be alive is always and already to breach boundaries or to be exposed to the risk of the outside entering the inside (read Litvintseva 2019). This disentanglement of life from discounted bodies, this redistribution of life on differential scales of insurability and non-insurability, is a key dimension of contemporary migration regimes. The latter aim either at slowing down the dynamics of people’s interactions, at creating distance or at shattering the chains of relations between them, so as to institute new patterns of separation. Contemporary movement restrictions are not limited to national boundaries. They are at work on a global scale. They are deepening the space and time asymmetries between different categories of humanity while leading to the progressive ghettoization of entire regions of the world. To a large extent, this is akin to a universalization of the Israeli model. In this model, the restriction of movement does not necessarily aim “to confine unwanted people territorially or to dissociate their movements from those of citizens, but to inscribe them into temporalities and spatialities that are disjointed to the point of giving these populations the illusion of being territorially separated” (Parizot 2018, 38). fFurthermore, at a time when the material components and biological organization of the body can be reengineered and redesigned, the latter are more than ever based on the ideas of repressive selection, reproduction and the rejuvenation of species. Only what can potentially generate value counts as life. In this context, borders are meant to concretize the principle of dissimilarity rather than that of affinity. They are not only obstacles to free movement. They are boundaries between species and varieties of the human. As such, they play a crucial role in contemporary modes of production of human difference and relatedness. Human bodies are increasingly divided between those that matter and those that do not, those who can move and those who cannot or should not, or should only move under very strict conditions. Bodies that should not move are those that are uninsured. They must be tracked, captured, and dispensed of. Such bodies are kept shifting between invisibility, waiting and effacement. They are trapped in fragmented spaces, stretched time and indefinite waiting (Peteet 2018). As for the dream of perfect security, it requires not only complete systematic surveillance, but also a cleansing policy. This dream is symptomatic of the structural tensions that, for decades, have accompanied our transition into a new technical system of increased automation – one that is increasingly complex yet also increasingly abstract. One of the major contradictions of the liberal order has always been the tension between freedom and security. Today, this question seems to have been cut in two. Security now matters more that freedom. A society of security is not necessarily a society of freedom. A society of security is a society dominated by the irrepressible need for adhesion to a collection of certainties. It is one fearful of the type of interrogation that delves into the unknown, unearthing the risks that must surely be contained within. This is why in a society of security, the priority is, at all cost, to identify what lurks behind each new arrival – who is who, who lives where, with whom and since when, who does what, who comes from where, who is going where, when, how, why, and so on and so forth. Moreover, who plans to carry out which acts, either consciously or unconsciously. The aim of a society of security is not to affirm freedom, but to control and govern the modes of arrival. The current myth claims that technology constitutes the best tool for governing these arrivals; that technology alone allows for the resolution of this problem – a problem of order, but also of awareness, of identifiers, of anticipation and predictions. It is feared that the dream of a humanity transparent to herself, stripped of mystery, might prove to be a catastrophic illusion. For the time being, migrants and refugees are bearing the brunt of it. In the long run, it is by no means certain that they will be the only ones. The mega processes highlighted above leave us with foundational questions that will haunt us for most of this century. The first foundational question is related to what I called ‘borderization’, or the logics of containment, enclosure, and contraction. Perhaps more than at any other moment in our recent past, we are increasingly faced with the question of what to do with those whose very existence does not seem to be necessary for our reproduction; those whose mere existence or proximity is deemed to represent a physical or biological threat to our own life. Throughout history, and in response to this foundational question, various paradigms of rules have been designed for human bodies deemed either in excess, unwanted, illegal, dispensable, or superfluous. One historical response has consisted in putting in place spatial exclusionary arrangements. Such was, for instance, the case during the early phases of modern settler or genocidal colonialism in relation to Native American reservations in the United States, island prisons, penal colonies such as Australia, camps and Bantustans in South Africa. A late modern example is Gaza, and Gaza might well prefigure what is yet to come. Here, control of vulnerable, unwanted, surplus or racialized people is exercised through a combination of tactics, chief among which is ‘modulated blockade’. A blockade prohibits, obstructs, and limits who and what can enter and leave the Strip. The goal might not be to cut the Strip off entirely from supply lines, infrastructural grids or trade routes. It is nevertheless relatively sealed off in a way that effectively turns it into an imprisoned territory. Comprehensive or relative closure is accompanied by periodic military escalations and the generalized use of extra-judicial assassinations. Spatial violence, humanitarian strategies, and a peculiar biopolitics of punishment all combine to produce, in turn, a peculiar detention space in which people deemed surplus, unwanted, or illegal are governed through abdication of any responsibility for their lives and their welfare. But there is another, early 21st-century example, which consists in waging new forms of wars, which can be called wars on speed and mobility. Wars on mobility are wars whose aim is to turn into dust the means of existence and survival of vulnerable people taken as enemies. These kinds of wars of attrition, methodically calculated and programmed, and implemented with new methods, are wars against the very ideas of mobility, circulation, and speed, whilst the age we live in is precisely one of velocity, acceleration, and increasing abstraction and algorithms. Moreover, the targets of this kind of warfare are not by any means singular bodies, but rather great swathes of humanity judged worthless and superfluous. All of the above belongs to the current practice of remote borderization, carried out from afar, in the name of freedom and security. This battle, waged against certain undesirables and reducing them to mounds of human flesh, is rolled out on a global scale. It is on the verge of defining the times in which we live. Wars on mobility are peculiar wars on bodies. They have to do with two broad questions that confront us today and will haunt us for most of this century: on the one hand the question of life futures, that is, of the self-organization of being and matter; on the other hand, that of the future of reason. The future of life and the future of reason For a long time, the human race has been concerned with how life emerges and the conditions of its evolution. The key question today is how it can be reproduced, sustained, made durable, preserved and universally shared, and under what conditions it ends. Overall, these debates about how life on Earth can be reproduced and sustained, and under what conditions it ends, are forced upon us by the epoch itself, characterized as it is by the impending ecological catastrophe and by technological escalation. It is a fact that, today, unprecedented numbers of human beings are embedded in increasingly complex technostructures. The latter are increasingly intervening in the dynamics of the Earth system on a planetary scale. This has led to the transgression of planetary boundaries such as those related to anthropogenic climate change, degenerative land-use change, accelerated biodiversity loss, perturbation of the global biogeochemical cycles of nitrogen and phosphorus, and the creation and release of novel entities such as nanoparticles and genetically engineered organisms (see Donges et al.). Furthermore, both metabolically (for example in terms of their energy needs) and reproductively, technologies are becoming more and more tied in complex networks of extraction and predation, manufacturing and innovation. An example is recent developments in the domain of genes and molecules. As Margarida Mendes shows, the heyday of DNA study has allowed the cracking and public dissemination of the genetic codes of humans, plants, and animals. This, in turn, has given way to an exponential rise of biological patents, as currently nearly 20% of the human genome is now privately owned, in a context of a market logic that addresses life as a commodity to be manipulated and replicated under the volatility of market consumption. Studies after studies have shown for instance that corporations are intervening directly in the natural cycles of life and ecosystems through the widespread genetic modification of key elements in the food chain (see Mendes 2017). As patented GMO genes are absorbed into our bodies in a proprietary relationship of biological subjugation, the body itself becomes an expanded, multiple infrastructure, where intervention can happen at many different scales. It is therefore correct to argue that there is a shifting distribution of powers between the human and the technological, in the sense that technologies are moving towards ‘general intelligence’ and self-replication. They are being granted the powers of reproduction and independent teleonomic purpose rather than having them taken away. Over the last decades, we have witnessed the development of algorithmic forms of intelligence. They have been growing in parallel with genetic research, and often in its alliance. The integration of algorithms and big data analysis in the biological sphere does not only bring with it an increasingly greater belief in techno-positivism and modes of statistical thought. It also paves the way for regimes of assessment of the natural world, and modes of prediction and analysis that treat life itself as a computable object. Concomitantly, algorithms inspired by the natural world, and ideas of natural selection and evolution are on the rise. Such is the case with genetic algorithms – a subset of evolutionary algorithms that mimic actions inspired in biological operators, such as cells, seeking to optimize the responses to the problems of their environments by self-generating, and encompassing processes of mutation and natural selection. The latter are designed to evolve and further adapt to the environment, in a process of self-generation. The belief today is that everything is potentially computable and predictable. In the process, what is rejected is the fact that life itself is an open system, non-linear, and exponentially chaotic.

## Advantage

### 1NC – AT: Advantage

#### 1] Right to strike turn – sole reliance on the right to strike weakens unions and turn case.

**1AC Casey 20** Leo Casey, 12-2-2020, "The Teacher Strike: Conditions for Success," Dissent Magazine, <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online_articles/the-teacher-strike-conditions-for-success>

The irony here is that reliance exclusively on the strike creates the very conditions for weakening it as a tactic, making it less powerful and less effective. One of the reasons why teacher strikes went from being formidable tools for improving the lives of teachers in the 1960s and early ’70s to becoming ineffective and at times counterproductive by the late ’70s and ’80s was the fact that teacher unions had become wholly dependent on it, and did not increase the repertoire of direct-action tactics in their arsenals. When the only tool a union has is the hammer of the strike, it treats every strategic challenge as a nail, even when different problems could be better addressed by a different direct-action tool or by political action.

#### 2] No uniqueness for the advantage. Teacher strikes are rising now: the Erie School District teacher strike, Scranton teacher strike, Co-op academy teacher strike, Pleasanton teacher strike, etc are all examples from within this month and prove that teachers are striking regardless of legality.

#### More evidence – every empiric flows neg.

Greenhouse 18 [Steven; Editor at NYT, author of a book about history of labor unions; "Making Teachers’ Strikes Illegal Won’t Stop Them,” The New York Times; 5/9/18; <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/09/opinion/teacher-strikes-illegal-arizona-carolina.html>] Justin

In the five states where teachers have gone on strike this year, teachers complain about many of the same things: low salaries, an education funding squeeze and teacher shortages. They have something else in common. In four of the five — Arizona, Kentucky, Oklahoma and West Virginia — these strikes are illegal under state law. (Colorado, the fifth state where teachers walked out, allows them.)

While private-sector workers generally have a right to strike under federal law, state law governs whether teachers and other state and local government workers can strike. Three dozen states have laws prohibiting teachers from striking. Clearly, making teacher strikes illegal will not necessarily prevent them.

In the states where teachers walked out, many teachers felt they had to beg their state legislatures to approve raises and the funding to pay for them. But their pleas were largely ignored. Joseph McCartin, a labor historian at Georgetown University, says that when workers feel they are at a dead end in negotiating raises, militant outbursts — such as illegal walkouts — are inevitable. “When collective bargaining isn’t allowed or doesn’t work, that doesn’t mean collective action isn’t possible,” he said.

Labor’s most potent weapon is the strike, even when it’s illegal. Workers will often risk engaging in an illegal strike, even though it could mean getting fined, fired and conceivably jailed. In a legal strike, workers typically lose just a few days’ or weeks’ pay.

Explosions of worker militancy have been a recurring pattern throughout American history. West Virginia teachers, for example, said their walkout was inspired by their state’s coal miners, who were part of a historic miners’ strike during World War II.

Ten days after Pearl Harbor was attacked in 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt summoned labor and business leaders to a conference where unions pledged not to strike during the war. The National War Labor Board, which included labor representatives, dictated a nationwide formula that capped how large a raise unions could obtain in bargaining. But the raises often failed to keep up with inflation, angering millions of workers.

As a result, there were dozens of short wildcat strikes — strikes without union authorization — in defiance of Roosevelt and union leaders. The biggest confrontation came in 1943, when the United Mine Workers’ brilliant but bullheaded president, John L. Lewis, gave 500,000 coal miners a wink and a nod, tacit approval for a walkout.

Roosevelt implored the miners to return to work. “Every idle miner directly and individually is obstructing the war effort,” he said in a fireside chat. He had the federal government seize the mines and ordered miners back to work, but eager to restore labor peace, he figured out a way to meet most of their pay demands.

In 1962, President John F. Kennedy issued an executive order giving most federal employees the right to bargain collectively over some working conditions, but not wages, and he barred them from striking. For years, postal workers seethed about low pay, and their frustration boiled over after members of Congress received a 41 percent raise in 1969.

On March 18, 1970, letter carriers walked out in New York City, and within days, more than 150,000 of the nation’s 600,000 postal workers had joined the illegal strike. One letter carrier boasted that the strikers were “standing 10 feet tall, instead of groveling in the dust.”

During the 1970 postal workers’ strike, military personnel sorted mail at New York City’s main post office.

President Richard M. Nixon denounced the strike, but he didn’t seek to fire or jail the strikers. He mobilized 24,000 military personnel to deliver the mail — not very successfully — and reached a deal that ended the strike after eight days. The postal workers won an initial 6 percent raise, and when Nixon signed the Postal Reorganization Act that summer, they received an additional 8 percent.

H. R. Haldeman, Nixon’s chief of staff, acknowledged a big obstacle to punishing these unlawful strikers. “The mailman is a family friend, so you can’t hurt him,” Haldeman said.

State officials unhappy about the recent strikes have realized the same thing: They can’t really punish or replace the teachers. They’re too popular, there are too many to replace, and if state officials try to jail a few ringleaders, that might spur new strikes.

Not every illegal walkout ends well for workers. When air traffic controllers went on strike in 1981, President Ronald Reagan fired 11,345 controllers and rallied the public against their union, the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization, emphasizing that every controller had taken a no-strike pledge upon being hired. Reagan also lambasted the union for rejecting the 11 percent raise his administration was offering, about twice what other federal employees had received at the time.

With the end of the Arizona teachers’ walkout last Thursday, there are rumblings about which state might be next. In North Carolina, educators are angry that teacher salaries and per-pupil spending have not kept up with inflation. Even though teacher strikes are illegal in North Carolina, teachers there say they will walk out next Wednesday, the day that the state legislature opens. Lawmakers should take them seriously. Teachers have so far managed to win gains and skirt the law without any penalty because public opinion — and a lot of history — seems to be on their side.

#### **Framing issue – ALL of their evidence is talking about how CURRENT strikes are enough and affecting national politics so the RIGHT TO STRIKE doesn’t increase solvency more – err heavily NEG since they haven’t read any solvency evidence.**

#### Their evidence definitely negates on this issue: we’ll insert rehighlightings in blue.

#### A]

**1AC LawInfo 20** [Peter Serdyukov, National University, La Jolla, California. 05/18/20, Teachers Unions & Collective Bargaining. <https://www.lawinfo.com/resources/labor-law/teachers-unions-collective-bargaining.html>] // SC SD

**In Texas, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, and South Carolina, collective bargaining was entirely prohibited for public employees as of 2014. Only 11 states explicitly give teachers the right to do things like going on strike, and many states make it completely illegal for public employees to strike. In some right-to-work states, these employees may be allowed to strike, but the power of unions to compel them to join is often significantly limited**. As major walkouts and strikes over low pay have shown, these rules aren't always successful at stopping collective action, and public opinion may be evolving about educators' rights as employees.

#### B]

1AC Richards 19 [[Erin Richards](https://www.usatoday.com/staff/2647805001/erin-richards/), 6-18-19, “Strikes, pay raises & charter protests: America's teachers' exhausting, exhilarating year” <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/education/2019/06/18/teacher-pay-raises-strike-last-day-of-school-summer/1437210001/>] // SC SD

"Oh, the places you'll go!" the popular Dr. Seuss book promises to new graduates.

And, this past year, to their teachers.

America's educators have survived a rollicking year in the public spotlight — and no slowdown is in sight.

In the last 18 months, we've seen **teachers striking for higher pay**, teachers running for political office, teachers protesting charter schools, teachers organizing insurgent groups within their unions and teachers broadcasting the state of their under-resourced classrooms.

USA TODAY tracked the pressures on America's teachers with a school-year-long series of stories, capped by a [nationwide analysis of teacher pay and housing costs](https://www.usatoday.com/in-depth/news/education/2019/06/05/teachers-pay-cost-of-living-teaching-jobs/3449428002/).

Here's what happened.

**It's working: Teachers are pushing policy changes**

Starting last summer, it was front-line teachers rather than policymakers driving the national discussion over how best to educate children and compensate educators.

**How the movement started:** [‘Any talks of striking?’ A West Virginia teacher’s Facebook post started a national wave](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/education/2019/02/20/teacher-strike-west-virginia-school-closings-education-bill/2848476002/)

Their actions are helping to change the narrative. Red-state governors who cracked down on teachers unions a decade ago and trimmed education budgets are now adding money to education efforts. In Texas, state Gov. Greg Abbott, a Republican, just signed into law [a $5 billion school finance package](https://bit.ly/2Y3pFuk), with much of the money slated for teacher raises.

In Oklahoma, home to [one of the first statewide teacher strikes](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2018/04/02/teacher-strikes-shut-down-schools-across-oklahoma-kentucky/478102002/) in 2018, Republicans passed a budget that offers about $200 million in new education spending, partly to fund teacher raises.

On the Democratic side, presidential candidates Kamala Harris, a senator from California, and Joe Biden, former vice president, have both made pay raises for teachers part of their platforms.

In general, the public has backed the idea.

In a national poll from USA TODAY and Ipsos Public Affairs, a majority of people said teachers [had the right to strike](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2018/09/12/teachers-union-strike-pay/1227089002/), a view held even by the parents whose lives were most disrupted when teachers walked off the job.

#### C]

1AC Will 10/27 (Madeline, citing working study by two Brown professors, 10-27-2021, "When Teachers Strike, Education Becomes More Prevalent in Political Campaigns, Study Finds," Education Week, https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/when-teachers-strike-education-becomes-more-prevalent-in-political-campaigns-study-finds/2021/10)

Teacher strikes have a profound and often unrecognized role in national politics, a new working paper suggests: They put education front and center in Congressional campaigns and advertisements. Holding a strike more than doubles the likelihood that a Congressional candidate will air an education ad in the area where the labor action occurred, write the authors of the paper, which has not yet been peer reviewed. The upshot is that despite the risky nature of shutting down schools, strikes may elevate the importance of education issues, and ultimately could give teachers’ unions more power in the national arena. “We were really interested in some of these broader political effects of teacher strikes,” said Melissa Arnold Lyon, a co-author of the study and a postdoctoral research associate at the Annenberg Institute at Brown University. “Teachers’ unions have increasing prominence as national actors in education politics.” Teacher strikes are generally rare, but in 2018, a surge of activism—deemed the #RedforEd movement—led to teachers across entire states walking out of their classrooms to call for higher wages and more school funding. There were statewide strikes or walkouts that year in West Virginia, Oklahoma, and Arizona, as well as large-scale protests that shut down schools in North Carolina, Kentucky, and Colorado. That level of activism helped boost support for raising teacher salaries and triggered sympathetic media attention to the plight of teachers. Still, the working paper found that the statewide strikes were not necessarily driving the overall findings—even individual strikes increase the probability of education-focused advertisements being aired. Lyon and Brown professor Matthew Kraft created a dataset of all U.S. teacher strikes between July 2007 and November 2018—totaling 540 district strikes, many of which were part of coordinated efforts in a single state—and analyzed that alongside databases of TV political ads for U.S. House of Representatives elections. The researchers compared election ads in media markets where strikes occurred and in markets that didn’t experience strikes. The researchers focused on ads from House of Representatives campaigns to show how the effects of teacher strikes reverberate beyond local or state politics. Also, campaign ads are expensive and represent a significant investment from a candidate—and past research has shown that political ads can affect voter preferences, election turnout, and future legislative agendas. The researchers found that most of the ads were positive: They promoted a candidate (instead of attacking them) and had uplifting music. Although teacher strikes have negative consequences on parents and students in the form of lost instruction time and child care, few ads disparaged teachers’ unions or called for stricter laws against striking, Lyon said. That effect holds true for both political parties. “Republicans just as much as Democrats are talking about education more as a result of teacher strikes, and they’re doing so in largely positive ways,” she said. The study also found that the effects of strikes on political ads are strongest in political battleground areas, where candidates are appealing to swing voters. “These findings highlight how candidates with the greatest concern for their election prospects are the most reactive to strikes,” the researchers wrote. “This implies that strikes lead political elites to believe that they have something to gain from discussing education issues.” Teacher strikes often have the public’s support The statewide strikes and those that happened in big cities in 2018 and 2019 were notable for going beyond the bread-and-butter issues typical in labor disputes. While teachers were fighting for salary increases, they framed the strikes as efforts to do what’s best for their students. They pointed to sparsely resourced classrooms, shoddy school infrastructure, and gaps in available student supports. That framing—that teachers were on the picket lines, sometimes risking their jobs, in order to provide what’s best for their students—helped galvanize public support.

#### 3] Reject Carpenter – the article is old and from 2017 which doesn’t account for the 2018 wave of strikes – independently bad because it proves they intentionally misrepresented the date as 2021 to avoid this turn.

Dam 19 [Andrew; 2/14/19; “Teacher strikes made 2018 the biggest year for worker protest in a generation,” The Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/us-policy/2019/02/14/with-teachers-lead-more-workers-went-strike-than-any-year-since/>] Justin

About 485,200 workers were involved in major work stoppages in 2018, new Labor Department data shows. It’s the highest figure since 1986.

The trend is striking.

Chart, bar chart
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The labor unrest wasn’t a result of prominent unions in manufacturing, such as United Automobile Workers, or transportation, such as Teamsters. It was driven by a wave of teacher strikes that spread from West Virginia (35,000 workers) to Oklahoma (45,000) and Kentucky (26,000). Within months, 267,000 more teachers in Arizona, Colorado and North Carolina staged walkouts.
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#### 4] Group LawInfo and Richards – strikes hurt working conditions in the long term.

Lovenheim and Bio 20 Lovenheim, M. F., & Bio, A. W. A. (2020, August 5). *A Bad Bargain*. Education Next. https://www.educationnext.org/bad-bargain-teacher-collective-bargaining-employment-earnings/. Sosa Re-Cut Justin

These data enable us to examine the effects of teacher collective-bargaining policies on multiple indicators of students’ labor-market success. Taken as a whole, our results clearly indicate that laws supporting collective bargaining for teachers have adverse long-term consequences for students.

Earnings. We find strong evidence that teacher collective bargaining has a negative effect on students’ earnings as adults. Attending school in a state with a duty-to-bargain law for all 12 years of schooling reduces later earnings by $795 dollars per year (see Figure 3). This represents a decline in earnings of 1.9 percent relative to the average. Although the individual effect is modest, it translates into a large overall loss of earnings for the nation as a whole. In particular, our results suggest a total loss of $196 billion per year accruing to those who were educated in the 34 states with duty-to-bargain policies on the books.

Hours worked. Consistent with this reduction in earnings, we also find that exposure to a duty-to-bargain law throughout one’s school years is associated with a decline of 0.49 hours worked per week. This is a 1.4 percent decline relative to the average, and it suggests that a reduction in hours worked is a main driver of the lower earnings.  
Wages. The reduced earnings caused by unionization could also reflect lower wages, and the evidence suggests a negative relationship between collective-bargaining exposure and wages. While this relationship is not statistically significant, it is consistent with our other results and suggests that teacher collective bargaining may also have a modest adverse effect on average wages.

Employment. The fact that teacher collective bargaining reduces working hours suggests that duty-to-bargain laws may also affect employment levels. In fact, when we use the share of individuals who are employed as the outcome variable, we find that duty-to-bargain laws reduce employment. Specifically, exposure to a duty-to-bargain law for all 12 years of schooling lowers the likelihood that a worker is employed by 0.9 percentage points. Duty-to-bargain laws have no impact on unemployment rates, however, suggesting that they reduce employment by leading some individuals to drop out of the labor force altogether.

Occupational skill level. Finally, we analyze the effects of collective bargaining on the skill level of a student’s selected occupation, as measured by the share of workers in that occupation who have any education beyond a high school diploma. The results suggest yet another negative effect: being exposed to a duty-to-bargain law for all 12 years of schooling decreases the proportion of such workers in an occupation by almost half of a percentage point (or 0.6 percent relative to the average). This effect is modest in size, but it implies that teacher collective bargaining leads students to work in occupations requiring lower levels of skill.

Educational attainment. The reduced earnings and labor force participation associated with teacher collective bargaining raise the possibility that affected students may have completed less education. Our analysis, however, finds little evidence of bargaining power having a significant effect on how much schooling students completed. This finding is surprising in light of the substantial labor-market effects we document, but it comports with prior research that has found no effect of duty-to-bargain law passage on high-school dropout rates.

Additionally, educational attainment is but one measure of the amount of human capital students accumulate. Even if students do not complete fewer years of education, they may be acquiring fewer skills while they are in school. We believe that our results concerning earnings and employment are driven by other aspects of school quality that are not reflected in educational attainment, and they reinforce the importance of studying labor-market outcomes directly in order to understand how major reforms such as the enactment of teacher collective-bargaining laws affect students’ life outcomes.

#### 5] The Will evidence definitely concludes that current strikes are enough which is literally the whole article about how change has already occurred. But –

#### A] The study isn’t peer reviewed.

1AC Will 10/27 (Madeline, citing working study by two Brown professors, 10-27-2021, "When Teachers Strike, Education Becomes More Prevalent in Political Campaigns, Study Finds," Education Week, https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/when-teachers-strike-education-becomes-more-prevalent-in-political-campaigns-study-finds/2021/10)

Holding a strike more than doubles the likelihood that a Congressional candidate will air an education ad in the area where the labor action occurred, write the authors of the paper, which has not yet been peer reviewed.

#### B] Definitely concludes neg – says increased strikes are bad – this is your conclusion.

1AC Will 10/27 (Madeline, citing working study by two Brown professors, 10-27-2021, "When Teachers Strike, Education Becomes More Prevalent in Political Campaigns, Study Finds," Education Week, https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/when-teachers-strike-education-becomes-more-prevalent-in-political-campaigns-study-finds/2021/10)

The researchers cautioned that if the frequency of teacher strikes continues to increase, strikes may lose their power and effect on political campaign ads.

#### 6] Exclusion turn

**Curtiss**, D. (**2020**, December 8). *What Happens to Vulnerable Students When Teachers Strike? (Opinion)*. Education Week. [https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/opinion-what-happens-to-vulnerable-students-when-teachers-strike/2019/02. //](https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/opinion-what-happens-to-vulnerable-students-when-teachers-strike/2019/02.%20/) Sosa Re-Cut Justin

When the Los Angeles Unified School District decided to relight the match of protest last month, teachers across the nation also caught flame. Denver. West Virginia. Oakland, Calif. In the past year, teacher strikes have reemerged as an effective tool to answer the long-standing demands of frustrated educators who need better pay, improved facilities, and more resources for high-need schools. During these strikes, much of the attention has been given to the most visible people in our schools: teachers, parents, and vocal and well-performing students. However, working as a special education paraprofessional for a public elementary school in South Los Angeles, I know that students of color, particularly those with disabilities, hardly ever get consideration when major decisions like these are made.

During the LAUSD strike, just a third of the district’s 600,000 students showed up to school on the strike’s first day. Students and families were forced to find all sorts of creative ways to facilitate learning, including taking advantage of free entry to museums and zoos, teaching classes at home, or rallying with teachers.

For low-income students and students with disabilities at high-need schools, many of those options were not feasible. Instead, non-credentialed school staff such as myself—along with sanitation workers, office personnel, and yard and recreational support—worked tirelessly to keep schools running for students in attendance. I saw the strike’s impact on the day-to-day experience of these students in high-need schools, even well after the strike has ended. Though the strike produced historic wins for teachers, it did not come without significant drawbacks for students whose voices have been historically suppressed in our schools: students of color, particularly black boys, with disabilities.

On January 14, the first day of the strike, droves of 4th, 5th, and 6th graders noisily filled our school’s auditorium for programming. This was standard protocol at many schools, but it was nearly impossible for our administrator to redirect the children’s attention to schoolwork amidst the mass confusion that both students and staff were experiencing. One student with whom I work closely, a boisterous and excitable 11-year-old black boy with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, paced up and down the auditorium floor. As he greeted friends and danced to pass time, a school administrator ferociously snapped at him to leave the auditorium.

Stunned, the student (along with some nervous staff like me) waited for clarification. Where would he go? All classrooms serving this age group at our school remained locked during the strike. It was raining outside. The school administrator told him he could keep himself occupied by walking around the school.

It was clear to me that the administrator, overwhelmed and with little support, made an exceptionally bad call. The student’s entire grade level was inside the auditorium with the only available credentialed staff. But what some might excuse as a temporary lapse in judgment was unfortunately all too common during the strike for students like him.

Although most administrators meant well, a general lack of understanding about the biased ways schools see children of color and students with disabilities created a hostile space for many children during the strike. Since resources were more scarce than usual during the strike, students in our school who were already considered “defiant” were now being chastised for little more than showing up. Many of their key advocates—the teachers who are more skilled in supporting their needs—were on the picket lines.

I watched as students were sent home for arbitrary and vague reasons or assigned mandatory escorts to the bathroom and class. In one case, the police were even called in to deal with a classroom infraction for a kindergarten student. The encounter left a young black boy screaming and crying in our school halls.

#### 7] Group the rest of the quality of education arguments – strikes hurt the underprivileged and destroy educational prospects.

Norton and Hernandez 18 [Hilary and Tracy; BizFed chair and executive director of FAST; CEO of the Los Angeles County Business Federation (BizFed) and president of IMPOWER Inc. BizFed is a grassroots alliance of more than 175 business organizations representing 395,000 businesses with nearly 4 million employees throughout Los Angeles County. BizFed advocates for policies and projects that strengthen the regional economy by exploring all sides of critical issues and takes action on policies to make a difference for business growth, job creation and economic vitality in Southern California; “Commentary: A teachers strike is bad for our students, families and economy,” LA School Report; 10/10/18; <http://laschoolreport.com/commentary-a-teachers-strike-is-bad-for-our-students-families-and-economy/>] Justin

When schools are closed due to strikes, students miss learning opportunities, parents must take days off from work and our region is disrupted. Beyond hurting families, this strike will hurt our businesses and their ability to sustain and create new jobs.

This potential strike by LAUSD teachers will be the first in nearly three decades. The strike in 1989 lasted nine days; the most recent teachers strike in West Virginia lasted seven days. For a family living paycheck to paycheck, over a week of unpaid time off to watch their children should not be the deciding factor between paying the rent and putting food on the table; the entire family’s livelihood is threatened. Imagine a single mom who is a nurse and has no one to watch her children. She must choose between leaving her children at home or missing a shift. That money cannot be paid back.

Every day that a student is not in the classroom, they lose learning opportunities. Students fall behind the content standards set by the California State Board of Education, and teachers have to add those lost days into their curriculum. Students lose daily social interactions with their peers, which helps build character and good citizenship. Think of a student who has the dream of being a doctor. They miss school and now are discouraged and lose the aspiration of being a doctor.

At-risk youth are the most vulnerable when there are school closures. If parents don’t have the ability to skip work during a teacher strike, can’t afford childcare or don’t have family that can help out, that means students are left unsupervised. Anyone who has children knows that the course of their lives can change in an instant. We must avoid putting our children’s health and safety at risk.

In LAUSD, over 84 percent of the students qualify for free or reduced-price meals; the district serves over 700,000 meals each day. For many of these students, this is their only chance to eat a healthy breakfast, lunch and supper after school. A child’s nutrition should not be compromised at the hands of this potential strike.

#### Strikes hurt students – studies prove.

Smith, M., Shaar, N., **& Divounguy**, O. (20**19**, October 2). *Teacher strikes hurt student outcomes and may worsen income inequality*. Illinois Policy. https://www.illinoispolicy.org/press-releases/teacher-strikes-hurt-student-outcomes-and-may-worsen-income-inequality/. / Sosa Re-Cut Justin

As the Chicago Teachers Union plans to announce this afternoon whether it will walk out on more than 360,000 students, [studies show](https://illinoispolicy.us1.list-manage.com/track/click?u=7fe208d3c85ffa1d03aeaade4&id=5ecc6a508a&e=0b391c8e91) strikes negatively affect student academic outcomes.

Research published in the National Bureau of Economic Research indicates strikes can temper growth in elementary student test scores by 2.2%. Given 90% of Chicago Public School students in 2018 were minority and 83% were classified as low-income, this means a strike will disproportionately harm those most in need and leave them to endure the long term negative consequences.

Experts from the nonpartisan Illinois Policy Institute are available to comment on how a strike would hurt minority and low-income students, potentially worsening income inequality.

How strikes harm student populations:

Test score decline: Expert consensus finds strikes have long-term negative effects on students. One study published by the NBER discovered that long strikes of 10 or more days have a significant negative effect on math test scores. Another published by Columbia University economists found extended disruptions, such as a strike, have negative effects on math and English achievement.

Less instruction: Unless the educational time lost during a strike is made up – such as by extending the school year – students lose the corresponding time in the classroom. In addition, students may require extensive review of material to get back up to speed.

Underperforming state averages: CPS already underperforms state academic achievement benchmarks. Its average SAT scores are 56 points lower than the state average, its four-year graduation rates are 11 percentage points lower and the percentage of CPS teachers rated proficient or excellent is 11 percentage points lower. A strike could exacerbate this.

Quote from Orphe Divounguy, chief economist for the nonpartisan Illinois Policy Institute:

“In the case of a teachers’ strike in Chicago, it is students who will ultimately be left behind. Lost classroom time worsens academic achievement and harms poor and disadvantaged students the most.

“With growing concerns about income inequality, the best way to ensure low-income students succeed is for CTU to accept Mayor Lightfoot’s generous offer and keep students in the classroom.”